Ireland Sabinized;

OR,

A CASE IN POINT.

DUBLIN:

PRITNED BY J. HILL, 51, ABBEY-STREET,

1799.

PRICE SIX PENCE HALFPENNY.

BRITISH MUSEUM

Ireland Sabinized,

&c.

A PAMPHLET has been lately written, and is now in circulation, on the ſubject of an *incorporating* union between the legiſlatures of Great Britain and Ireland. Some ſay it was written by an *agent of government*, others ſay it was written by an *United Iriſhman*. However let the author be whom he may, he has introduced the conduct of the Sabines in this union with the Romans, for our preſent *imitation*. This muſt have been the reſult of either ignorance or wickedneſs, and when we look into the Sabine hiſtory and ſee the cauſes

and conſequences of *that union*, it would rather appear to reſult from the latter, and that the author muſt heve been an United Iriſhman, or ſome other *enemy* to *this* country, who wiſhed under colour of the Sabine union, to imbibe the ſpirit of diſaffection and *rebellion* into the minds of the people. My object now is to expoſe the fallacy and hypocriſy of this incendiary, and by briefly ſtating the true hiſtory of *that union*, ſhew how far it is prudent *for us* to imitate the conduct of the Sabines, or rather to *take warning from* their *example*.

In the reign of Romulus, the firſt king of the Romans, they made a feaſt, and exhibited games and ſhews to induce the Sabine women to come and ſee them; this from the contiguity of the Sabine nation to the Roman ſtate had the deſired effect, and then the *Romans*, by way of *preface* to their future actions and *intentions* towards the Sabines, ſeized all the women and ran away with them; this of courſe brought on a war between the two nations, which, through the interference of the Sabine women, ended in an union, and this is the union which is held up to us for imitation.

Now as to the *original cauſe* of this union, I can ſee nothing in it very grateful to an Iriſh mind: the *Romans* firſt nationally laid a ſnare for the Sabines their neighbours, *they unfortunately* fell into it, the Romans then *violated* all the *rules of hoſpitality*, and robbed their neighbours of their wives and daughters, and then forſooth, by way of compenſation for this conduct, *they offered them an union.*

The firſt article of *this union* was, that *the king of the* Romans *and the king of the* Sabines *ſhould reſide and reign jointly at Rome*, but ſo far from either party having an idea of an *incorporation of legiſlatures*, that Tacius, the Sabine king, on his removal to Rome, ſtill kept up a council or ſenate of one hundred *Sabines*, who held their ſittings at his own palace, on the hill Tarpeius, and the Sabine people were governed under this *ſeparate legiſlature, independent of the Roman ſenate.*

So far therefore as the principle of this *original* union between the Sabines and the Romans goes, ſo far is the *Iriſh nation at preſent* connected with

England. The king of Ireland reſides in London, as the Sabine king reſided in Rome; he governs Ireland jointly with the king of England, much more ſo than the Roman king did the Sabines under their *original* union, and the Iriſh nation has no greater priviledge in her *ſeparate* legiſlature, than the Sabines had in being governed under a *ſeparate* council or ſenate of their own nation, who held their ſittings at the palace of their own king. If we are therefore to follow the *example* of the Sabines in their firſt ſteps, we will clearly *remain as we are*, for we are *now* upon the ſame footing with England in principle, that they were with Rome, *under their original union*, and this original union is certainly the beſt evidence of their original intention.

But I may be now told that *this* is not the union which the author of the pamphlet alludes to, that this is not a fit example for the Iriſh nation at the preſent day, that it is the ſubſequent *incorporation* of this *Sabine* ſenate with the *Roman* ſenate, which he wiſhes to point out for our imitation, as the act which laid *the foundation of Roman greatneſs.* I doubt however

very much, that the circumſtances attending this incorporating union will anſwer his purpoſe better with the people of Ireland, than the caſe of the *original* union, however let us examine it.

A few years after the paſſing of this original union, the terms of which the Sabine people thought were as ſolemn and ſacred as our bill of rights, the Roman air having had that convincing quality with the *Sabine ſenate*, that it is rumoured the air of St. James has lately had on ſome of our own great ones, *they* ſurrendered their *independence* (I would not ſay ſold their country, for it is a harſh expreſſion) and with their independence the liberties of their country; and they incorporated with the Roman ſenate; and Tacius their king dying about that time, the Romans ſuffered no Sabine king to ſucceed him, but the whole government of their original union fell to Romulus and the Roman ſenate, ſo that the Sabines, in about five years from the union to the death of Tacius loſt their *ſeparate legiſlatnre*, and loſt the pri-

viledge of being governed by a king of their own nation, and the *articles* of the union became a rope of ſand when they ſtood in the way of the *grapling power* of the *Romans*, and the conſequence was, that the Sabine families of diſtinction went to reſide at *Rome*, and the people grew diſaffected.

Now what in all this is worthy of imitation? Are we to *incorporate* with *England* to give her an opportunity of breaking the firſt article of the union within five years, as the *Romans* did with the *Sabines*, or to induce our *Iriſh* gentry to go reſide in *London*, that our people may become diſaffected? No, I rather think every Iriſhman will ſee on the face of this *incorporating* union, ſufficient to diſguſt him with the idea, rather than induce him to follow the example of it in any reſpect.

Had the *Romans* contented themſelves with their original union with the *Sabines* (which as before ſtated is ſimilar to our *preſent* connection with England) it would have ſaved them

vaſt expence of blood and treaſure, they might have enjoyed all the benefits of the Sabine *connexion*, without having to encounter the complicated evils that followed; but *connexion* would not ſatisfy them, nothing leſs than incorporation, and mark the dreadful conſequences that followed.

The Sabine people ſeeing themſelves ſold and betrayed by their *ſenate*, and the articles of the union, their bill of rights, violated, and trampled under foot, immediately imbibed a ſpirit of diſaffection and rebellion, and as they could not have *connexion* without *incorporation* with the Romans, they determined on ſeparation, without either; this diſaffection growing ſtronger and ſtronger every day, at laſt ripened into *rebellion*, and in the reign of Tullus Holtiſius, they took up arms, and entered into an open rebellion againſt the *Romans*, but were defeated.

A few years after, they *rebelled* again in the reign of Ancus Marcius, and it ſeems this re-

bellion was more ſerious than the former one, for though he put down the rebellion, we are told he granted them honourable terms.

Tarquin coming to the throne ſhortly after, and knowing their diſaffection, took occaſion to make war upon them on pretence of their having ſecretly aſſiſted the Hetrurians; but they had now grown ſo powerful, that they reſiſted him with great vigour for four years before he could reduce them.

In the reign of Tarquin the ſecond, they *rebelled* again, and after ſome time, were overcome, and then he obliged them for the firſt time to become tributary to Rome.

The Sabines continued this diſaffection even under the commonwealth, for during the conſulſhip of M. Valerius, they broke out again and over-run the *Roman* territories, and though they were defeated, they rallied again the ſame year.

Next year, in the conſulſhip of Poplicola, they broke out again, and having all along proteſted againſt their ſenate *ſurrendering* their legiſlative independence, and *incorporating* with the Romans, and very juſtly conceiving that their ſenate, who were only truſtees for the people, and were tenants for years, *could not* defeat the rights of their ceſtui que truſts, or transfer the fee, and that *ſuch incorporation muſt* in itſelf be an act null and void, and could only operate as an *abdication* of their legiſlative functions, but could not at all *defeat the original right* of the people to *legiſlate* for themſelves, the people therefore now reſumed that *indiſputable original right*, and ſet up a *ſeparate diet or legiſlature* in their own country, in which we are told one Actius Clauſus (an Engliſied Sabine) ſpoke ſtrongly againſt their continuing their oppoſition to the Romans, and adviſed them tamely to ſubmit, however they were determined and ſtill perſiſted, though the Roman forces in the end put them down.

Notwithſtanding which, they renewed the rebellion the very next year, in the conſulſhip of P. Poſthumius, and marched to the very gates of Rome, and at firſt ſo checked the Romans, that in the fluſh of victory, they ſent them a meſſage, commanding them to receive their laws, and this rebellion afterwards continued ſo obſtinate, that it was not ſubdued until the next year.

Though they were thus repeatedly defeated, they ſtill remained obſtinate, and as ſoon as they had gathered ſufficient ſtrength, they broke out again, and were proceeding to overrun the Roman territories, until the Roman ſenate found it *abſolutely neceſſary* to appoint Marcus Valerius, Dictator, who marched himſelf againſt them and defeated them.

In the conſulſhip of Q. Servilius, they again rebelled, and were defeated.

They alſo broke out in the conſulſhip of Valerius under one Appius Herdonius, a Sa-

bine, and having attacked Rome, they took the temple of Jupiter, and the fortreſs adjoining, and oppoſed the Romans ſo deſperately, that Valerius himſelf was killed in one of the engagements.

And they again broke out in the conſulſhip of M. Horatius, but were then finally ſubdued. So that it took the Romans, beſides the vaſt expence of blood and treaſure, a period of near 250 years, during which they had to encounter *eleven rebellions*, and in the end nearly deſtroyed and depopulated the country, in order to ſeal this incorporating union, not after all with the ſanction, but the bare forced ſubmiſſion of the people, and as we are gravely told, to lay the foundation of Roman greatneſs.

We have now before us three diſtinct things attendant on this union. The firſt or original union, the ſubſequent or incorporating union, and the conſequences that followed this incorporation. There is no exaggeration in any part of it; the whole is laid down in ancient hiſtory.

As to the firſt, which is the only union that received the ſanction of the people, we are already aſſimilated to it in principle in our preſent connection with England, as to the ſecond, it carries upon the face of it ſufficient to turn us from it. It was a violation of the firſt without the conſent of one of the contracting parties, the Sabine people. This is clear for the eleven reaſons I have juſt now mentioned, and that being the caſe, is ſtrong preſumptive evidence, that it was alſo the reſult of venality, and as to the conſequences, who can behold ſuch a ſcene of blood, deſolation, and rebellion, without horror, and without ſeeing that if the Sabine people were poſſeſſed of power equal to their ſpirit, the reſult muſt have been final ſeparation.

For my own part, though at the time that the queſtion of the union was ſtarted, my judgment heſitated, yet from what I have ſince ſeen on the ſubject, and now that I have minutely examined the hiſtory of the Sabines, to which I am referred for imitation, I ſhudder

at the very idea of it. If we remain as we are, we close in with the wise policy of the Sabines, as founded in their original union (if even that union itself could be considered wise for them) but if we follow them any farther, if we incorporate, then (to follow the similitude) we plunge into the dreadful vortex of VIOLATED FAITH, BROKEN TREATIES, EMIGRATION OF ALL DISTINCTION AND WEALTH, GENERAL DISAFFECTION, HORRID REBELLION, and perhaps a FINAL AND CONVULSIVE SEPARATION, and then,

Alas! Poor IRELAND!

FINIS.

BRITISH
12 JU 33
MUSEUM